

operation and maintenance of inland LNG export facilities that are operating or that have been proposed for development in densely populated communities in Florida. Unaware that FERC has disclaimed jurisdiction over inland LNG export facilities, local agencies punt citizen questions and concerns to the Commission. FERC has created a regulatory gap. It is time for FERC to fix that gap by revoking its 2014 and 2015 Orders that caused the gap.

A brief list of Florida facilities is included in FERC [Accession Number 20210817-4000](#), “Comments of WWALS Watershed Coalition re NFE Miami LNG under CP20-466,” and we incorporate that list below, with some updates.

### **1. New Fortress Energy, Miami, Florida**

6800 NW 72nd Street, Miami, Florida. See FERC FOIA FY21-04. Also known as American LNG Marketing LLC, LNG Holdings. Approved by DOE for LNG export, DOE/FE ORDER NO. 3690 AUGUST 7, 2015, FE DOCKET NO. 14-209-LNG. <https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2015/08/f25/ord3690.pdf> Facility is producing 100,000 gallons/day of LNG and storing 270,000 gallons onsite. <https://www.energy.gov/fe/american-lng-hialeah-facility-terminal> First containerized LNG export occurred on February 5, 2016. As of November, 2015, PHMSA had not received required data for analysis to ensure compliance with CFR Title 49, Subpart B, Part 193). Facility claimed a B5.7 Categorical Exclusion from NEPA review by the DOE in order to export LNG to non-FTA nations that went unchallenged by any federal agency.

### **2. New Fortress Energy, Titusville, FL**

Titusville Logistics Center, 7600-7724 US-1, Titusville, FL 32780. Also known as American LNG Marketing, TICO Development Partners. DOE/FE ORDER NO. 3656 MAY 29, 2015, authorized LNG export to Free Trade Agreement countries, “*up to 600,000 metric tons per annum, which American LNG states is equivalent to approximately 30.2 billion cubic feet per year (Bcf/yr) of natural gas (0.08 Bcf per day).*”

<https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2015/08/f25/ord3656.pdf>

But PHMSA denied approval on October 2, 2018, because of lack of a “Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA)” with “site drawings, maps, and other supporting documents.”

<https://www.phmsa.dot.gov/sites/phmsa.dot.gov/files/docs/standards-rulemaking/pipeline/special-permits-state-waivers/69596/2016-0073-tico-lod-denial.pdf>

PHMSA still lists it as denied, “*Last updated: Wednesday, October 17, 2018*”.

<https://www.phmsa.dot.gov/pipeline/special-permits-state-waivers/phmsa-2016-0073>

If constructed, this facility would be in violation of CFR Title 49, Subpart B, Part 193.2155(b). Citizens were forced to